

Remarks/Arguments

This paper is submitted responsive to the Office Action mailed March 1, 2007. Reconsideration of the application in light of the accompanying remarks and amendments is respectfully requested.

In the aforesaid action, the Examiner rejected the claims over three separate primary references, namely WO 99/13522 (hereafter "WO '522"), US 4,389,467 to Singh (hereafter "Singh '467") and DE 19517443 (hereafter "DE '443"). The Examiner also relied upon US 6,296,962 to Minh (hereafter "Minh '962") as a secondary reference for rejecting claims 22 and 46.

By the present paper, the claims are amended to remove language which was held indefinite in a related application, and dependent claims have been added which are drawn to further features of several preferred embodiments of the invention. No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

First, the pending claims have been amended to remove the term "compliant" which has been found in a related application to be indefinite. While it is believed here as in that application that this language is sufficiently definite to comply with 35 USC 112, the amendment is nevertheless made to remove the language and simplify prosecution of the application.

Each of claims 1, 25 and 49 has been amended to call for the structure as shown in Figure 3, wherein the interconnect is itself made of a woven structure or substructure, and the woven substructure is formed into a superstructure as shown in Figure 3. Dependent claims are also added which call for a superstructure which has a

substantially sinusoidal cross section along two different lines within the plane of the interconnect. In connection with all these claims, it is pointed out that the superstructure is itself defined by a woven substructure as these terms are defined in the specification. Thus, these claims call for an interconnect comprising a woven substructure, with the woven substructure formed to define a superstructure having the spaced contact zones as claimed. It is submitted that none of the art of record discloses or suggests this subject matter.

Starting with WO '522, layers 136 and 144 are flat structures, and do not at all define a superstructure with spaced contact zones as claimed by claims 1, 25 and 49 as amended. It is also noted that WO '522 is silent as to any other shape besides flat which could be utilized for layers 136 and 144. Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that WO '522 clearly fails to anticipate the subject matter of claims 1, 25 and 49 as amended. Further, given the overall desire of the skilled artisan to make such structures as compact as possible, it is submitted that there is clearly motivation to NOT form the flat layers 136 and 144 of WO '522 into a superstructure with spaced contact zones as called for in the present claims.

Turning to Singh '467, it is noted that current collectors 27, 29 are shown as a single line in the drawings. The specification calls these components corrugated metal sheets or mesh, and states that their purpose is to electrically connect and support the respective electrodes. It is submitted that this teaching does not at all disclose the subject matter of the present claims as discussed above. Specifically, it is submitted

that while Singh '467 might be found to disclose either a mesh or a corrugated metal sheet, it does not disclose or suggest a woven substructure formed into the inventive superstructure and defining spaced contact zones as claimed.

Finally, DE '443 is also submitted to fall short of claims 1, 25 and 49 as amended. DE '443 discloses a current collector in the form of a wire mesh. Various embodiments of this mesh are illustrated in the figures of DE '443. As shown therein, no structure is illustrated which meets the limitations of claims 1, 25 and 49 as they relate to an interconnect defined according to the claims. DE '443 shows a either s substructure or a superstructure, but not both.

It is noted that none of the art of record appears to disclose or suggest the subject matter of claims 53-55 as well.

New claims 56-58 have been added and are drawn to the embodiment of the invention shown in Figure 7, wherein the interconnect has connecting portions as shown in the figure which converge as they extend from one contact surface to the other. As shown, this defines a substantially dove tail shape of the interconnect which is one preferred embodiment of the subject matter of the present invention. It is submitted that none of the art of record discloses or suggests this subject matter.

An earnest and thorough effort has been made to resolve all issues raised in the Office Action and to place this application in condition for allowance. If, upon considering this response, the Examiner is of the opinion that issues remain which could be resolved by telephone

10/758,843

Dated July 2, 2007

Response to Office Action mailed March 1, 2007

interview, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss same.

A one month extension of time has been authorized along with filing of this paper. It is believed that no additional fee is due. If, however, any such fee is due, please charge same to Deposit Account 02-0184.

Respectfully submitted,

By ___/George a. coury/___

George A. Coury 34309

Attorney for the Applicant

Tel 203-777-6628, x113

Fax 203-865-0297

July 2, 2007

E-mail: docket@bachlap.com